

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 9, 16, 17, and 18 are amended to further clarify the claimed embodiments of the present invention. Claims 2, 3, and 15 have been cancelled as the features of these claims have been incorporated into the independent claims. The amendments are supported by the specification. No new matter is added.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by Shrader et al. (hereinafter "Shrader"), U.S. Patent No. 6,473,894 in view of US Patent Publication 2002/0107680 to Duggan et al. (hereinafter "Duggan") and further in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0133603 to Mitomo et al. (hereinafter Mitomo). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections in light of the amendments and arguments contained herein.

Independent claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to further clarify the invention. The claimed embodiments of the present invention provide an application launcher testing system to test application launchers. Among other features, as further clarified by the amended claims, embodiments of the present invention include an application launcher in communication with a HTTP server, wherein the application launcher exits upon launching a test application and returns an exit code that indicates the launch status of the test application. The status server provides the status of the executing test application to the test monitor through a socket opened to the status server by the test application in order to facilitate communication of the test results of the executing test application to the test monitor. (*See page 15, line 14 – page 16, line 7*).

The browser (application launcher) in Shrader in view of Duggan and further in view of Mitomo will not be able to allow the test application to execute or to provide the status of


the test application running on the browser once the browser exits. As mentioned with reference to Figure 4 of Shrader, the process begins by starting a web browser application (application launcher), starting an applet (test application) on the browser (Figure 4, step 402), executing the applet on the browser, writing the status information to the test output file (Figure 4, steps 404 and 406), writing the marker file to indicate completion of the execution of the applet (Figure 4, step 408), exiting of the applet upon successful completion and closing the web browser application (Figure 4, step 410) and concluding with the exiting of the process. (Column 8, lines 22-45). This clearly indicates that the test applet (test application) in Shrader has to complete before the browser (application launcher) can exit. The test applet cannot run without the browser being on at all times during the test applet run time. Neither Duggan nor Mitomo suggest a cure to the above-mentioned deficiencies of Shrader.

The Applicants have considered the comments made by the Examiner in the Advisory Action dated February 1, 2007, wherein the Examiner points out that the argument presented in the Applicants last amendment dated December 11, 2006, “imply that the application launcher necessarily exits “immediately” after launching the test application, before any other operations are performed.” (Advisory Action page 2). The Applicants would like to clarify that the amendment emphasizes that the application launcher exits upon launching the test application and had amended the claims to reflect this clarification. In order to further distinguish the claimed invention from the suggested references, the Applicants have further amended the independent claims to include “the application launcher exits after launching the test application with an exit code.” The Applicants reiterate that this further clarification along with the original amendment made in the last amendment dated December 11, 2006, (the application launcher exiting upon launching the test application) clearly distinguishes the claimed invention from the references, as the references alone or combined do not suggest

these features. Support for the amendments are already present in the specification and hence no new matter has been presented. The test application continues executing (even after the application launcher has exited) and provides status to the status server through socket connection and the test monitor receives the status of the executing test application from the status server. Based on the argument presented, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is in a condition for allowance and respectfully request the examiner to withdraw the 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1, 7 and 16. Claims 4-6, 8-14 and 17-20 are dependent on the amended independent claims and based on the arguments presented for the independent claims 1, 7 and 16, submit that the claims 4-6, 8-14 and 17-20 are allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection.

Accordingly, after entry of the present Amendment, the application is now in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6905. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP019). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

  
Jayanthi Minisandram  
Reg. No. 53,330

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6905  
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901  
Customer No. 32,291